

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	CRIMINAL NO. _____
v.	:	DATE FILED: _____
IRVIN ELLIS	:	VIOLATIONS:
	:	26 U.S.C. § 7206(1) (false tax returns -
	:	4 counts)

INFORMATION

COUNT ONE

THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY CHARGES THAT:

At all times material to this information:

1. Defendant **IRVIN ELLIS** was an attorney operating a law practice.
2. Defendant **IRVIN ELLIS** was required by law to report all income from his law practice on Schedule C of Internal Revenue Service Form 1040.
3. On or about April 9, 1998, in Philadelphia, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, defendant

IRVIN ELLIS

wilfully made and subscribed a United States income tax return, Form 1040, for the calendar year 1997, which was verified by a written declaration that it was made under the penalty of perjury and filed with the Director, Internal Revenue Service Center, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, which defendant **IRVIN ELLIS** did not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, in that the return reported, on line 1 of Schedule C to the return, gross receipts of his law

practice of \$215,350, when, as defendant **IRVIN ELLIS** knew, his law practice had gross receipts of approximately \$415,003.83, a difference of \$199,653.83.

In violation of Title 26, United States Code, Section 7206(1).

COUNT TWO

THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FURTHER CHARGES THAT:

1. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Count One are realleged as if fully restated here.

2 On or about April 15, 1999, in Philadelphia, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, defendant

IRVIN ELLIS

wilfully made and subscribed a United States income tax return, Form 1040, for the calendar year 1998, which was verified by a written declaration that it was made under the penalty of perjury and filed with the Director, Internal Revenue Service Center, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, which defendant **IRVIN ELLIS** did not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, in that the return reported, on line 1 of Schedule C to the return, gross receipts of his law practice of \$232,475, when, as defendant **IRVIN ELLIS** knew, his law practice had gross receipts of approximately \$569,295.65, a difference of \$336,820.65.

In violation of Title 26, United States Code, Section 7206(1).

COUNT THREE

THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FURTHER CHARGES THAT:

1. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Count One are realleged as if fully restated here.
2. On or about March 17, 2000, in Philadelphia, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, defendant

IRVIN ELLIS

wilfully made and subscribed a United States income tax return, Form 1040, for the calendar year 1999, which was verified by a written declaration that it was made under the penalty of perjury and filed with the Director, Internal Revenue Service Center, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, which defendant **IRVIN ELLIS** did not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, in that the return reported, on line 1 of Schedule C to the return, gross receipts of his law practice of \$295,230, when, as defendant **IRVIN ELLIS** knew, his law practice had gross receipts of approximately \$527,983.06, a difference of \$232,753.06.

In violation of Title 26, United States Code, Section 7206(1).

COUNT FOUR

THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY FURTHER CHARGES THAT:

1. Paragraphs 1 and 2 of Count One are realleged as if fully restated here.
2. On or about April 15, 2001, in Philadelphia, in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, defendant

IRVIN ELLIS

wilfully made and subscribed a United States income tax return, Form 1040, for the calendar year 2000, which was verified by a written declaration that it was made under the penalty of perjury and filed with the Director, Internal Revenue Service Center, at Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, which defendant **IRVIN ELLIS** did not believe to be true and correct as to every material matter, in that the return reported, on line 1 of Schedule C to the return, gross receipts of his law practice of \$104,500, when, as defendant **IRVIN ELLIS** knew, his law practice had gross receipts of approximately \$133,806.94, a difference of \$29,306.94.

In violation of Title 26, United States Code, Section 7206(1).

PATRICK L. MEEHAN
UNITED STATES ATTORNEY